

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 11-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 2,929,519). Claim 20 has been allowed, and the Examiner indicates that claims 3-7, and 10 include patentable subject matter since these claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

In the Office Action, the grounds of rejection state on page 7 of the Office Action that the claimed lifting units comprise the two fore (14) and two aft (15) linkage assemblies (citing Figures 1 and 3-5). The grounds of rejection further state that these lifting units are interpreted as being disposed in the corner zones of the frame units.

Solely to advance prosecution of exemplary embodiments of the invention, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to further define that the claimed lifting units/means of the present invention include piston rods extendible in a direction substantially orthogonal to the lower frame unit and that are connected to the upper frame unit, such as shown in Figure 2 of the present application. In this manner, for example, extension of the piston rod of the actuator itself pushes the upper frame unit (see specification at paragraph [018]). In Taylor, however, fore and aft linkage assemblies in a scissor configuration, along with track members 28 and 29 are required to push the supporting rails 16. As such, the present invention clearly distinguishes from Taylor.

Since the piston rods, their configuration, and their operation have previously been reviewed by the Examiner (particularly in, for example, claims 3-6 which the Examiner indicates

include patentable subject matter), Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims would not seem cause for a new art search.

Amendment to claim 16

The Examiner has noted that the phrase “test stand for motor vehicles” in the preamble of the claims has not been given patentable weight because the body of the claims does not rely upon the phrase for completeness. Applicants have amended claim 16 in a manner that the features of the body of claim 16 depend on the preamble for completeness. Since the test stand feature has previously been reviewed by the Examiner (for example, in claim 10), Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 16 would not seem cause for a new art search.

As such, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

U.S. Application No. 10/644,907
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Q74473

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 27, 2006